

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
DIVISION OF JUDGES

UNITED ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS, INC.

and

Case No. 2-CA-29343

LOCAL 363, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO

Margit Reiner, Esq., for the General Counsel.
Andrew Houlding, Esq. (Rome, McGuigan,
Sabanosh, P.C.), of Bridgeport, Connecticut, for the Respondent.

DECISION

STEPHEN J. GROSS, Administrative Law Judge. The Respondent, United Electrical Contractors (hereafter UEC), is an electrical contractor based in Waterbury, Connecticut. UEC admits that it is an employer engaged in interstate commerce for purposes of the National Labor Relations Act (the Act).

In the autumn of 1995 UEC began work in Newburgh, New York, at the site of a future Pepsi-Cola bottling plant. (All events I refer to in this decision occurred in 1995, unless I indicate otherwise.)

In mid-November an electrician, Thomas Murphy, applied to UEC for employment at the Pepsi-Cola job site. According to the General Counsel, in the course of the job interviews that led to UEC hiring Murphy, members of management violated Section 8(a)(1) of the National Labor Relations Act by coercively interrogating him.

On December 15 UEC added another electrician to the crew it already had working at the site. That electrician was not a member of the IBEW or, at least, UEC's management assumed that he was not. Numerous members of IBEW Local 363 had previously applied to UEC for electricians' work.¹ The General Counsel contends that UEC failed to consider these IBEW-affiliated applicants for that position and that this refusal to consider them stemmed from UEC's animus toward the IBEW. The General Counsel contends that UEC thereby violated Section 8(a)(3) and (1) of the Act.²

¹ UEC admits that IBEW Local 363 is a labor organization.

² In the course of the hearing I granted motions by the General Counsel to amend the complaint in minor respects. The transcript, at pages 218 (beginning at line 9) and 219, indicates numerous questions by me of the witness (Anthony Vaccarelli). In fact, all such questions were posed by counsel for Respondent, with the exception of the question asked at lines 9-11 on page 218.

My conclusions are that: (1) the record fails to show that any agent of UEC unlawfully interrogated any employee; and (2) UEC did violate Section 8(a)(3) and (1) of the Act by failing to consider numerous job applications because of the applicants' membership in the IBEW.

5 THE ALLEGED UNLAWFUL INTERROGATION

The question is whether two members of management asked employee Thomas Murphy about Murphy's union affiliations and those of a fellow electrician whom Murphy recommended that UEC employ.³

10

Murphy's viewpoint about unions is, essentially, that they are nuisances. As a matter of convenience he maintains membership in the Teamsters Union. In order to obtain a job he considers attractive he will join any other union specified by the collective-bargaining agreement to which the employer is a party.

15

As of mid-November (1995) Murphy had been living and working for some substantial period of time in North Carolina. But at that point his father became ill, and Murphy moved (temporarily) to his parents' home – about 35 miles from Newburgh, New York – and immediately began searching for employment in that area.

20

On the morning of November 18, a Poughkeepsie newspaper carried a classified advertisement by which UEC sought applications from electricians. Murphy read the advertisement that morning and forthwith telephoned UEC's office. He spoke to UEC's president, Anthony Vaccarelli. Two or three days later, Murphy submitted an application to UEC and spoke to UEC's foreman at the Pepsi-Cola job site, Jeff Lowy, and, again, to Anthony Vaccarelli.

25

Murphy entered UEC's employ – as an electrician at the Pepsi-Cola site – on November 27. His employment with UEC ended in June 1996.

30

Murphy continued to live with or near his parents for some additional period of time. He then returned to North Carolina, where he was living (and working) at the time of the hearing.

35

Murphy was the General Counsel's first witness. From the start of his testimony it was altogether plain that Murphy was a most reluctant witness; he was unhappy about having to testify, and he was furious with the General Counsel for having called him as a witness.

40

Counsel for the General Counsel asked Murphy about his conversations with Anthony Vaccarelli and with Lowy that led to UEC hiring Murphy. Counsel for the General Counsel further questioned Murphy about his conversations with Anthony Vaccarelli by which Murphy recommended that UEC hire a friend of Murphy's, Jerry Deschaines.

45

Murphy testified that, in effect, he remembered nothing of those conversations.

Murphy had provided the General Counsel with an affidavit that purports to describe the conversations at issue. Counsel for the General Counsel had Murphy read the affidavit to himself (while Murphy was on the witness stand) and asked Murphy whether the affidavit refreshed his memory. Murphy said that it did not.

50

³ The complaint refers to only one supervisor. It alleges that "on or about November 18 and 20, Anthony Vaccarelli interrogated job applicants about their union affiliation and sympathies and union sympathies of other prospective applicants."

I do not credit that testimony. It is more likely than not that, even before being presented with his affidavit, Murphy remembered the conversations. And surely the affidavit did refresh his recollection (whether or not the affidavit is accurate).

I have been referring to Murphy's affidavit. That affidavit is dated October 1996; that is, almost a year after Murphy's conversations with Anthony Vaccarelli and Lowy. The way that affidavit came into being is this: In about October 1996 Murphy was still working in the Newburgh area, albeit for an employer other than UEC. A business agent of IBEW Local 363, Sam Fratto, happened onto that job site and, in the course of a conversation with Murphy, discovered that Murphy had worked for UEC. Fratto asked Murphy to speak with a Board agent about the circumstances by which Murphy came to be employed by UEC. The record tells us nothing about why Murphy agreed to meet with the Board agent. In any event, meet they did, the Board agent prepared a proposed affidavit, and Murphy signed the affidavit, swearing to its accuracy.

Counsel for the General Counsel moved for admission into evidence almost all of the affidavit. I granted the General Counsel's motions, over the objections of UEC's counsel.

Murphy's affidavit does indeed refer to purported conversations between Murphy and UEC supervisors. If I were to accept these references in the affidavit as affirmative evidence of what happened during the course of those conversations, they would support the conclusion that agents of UEC unlawfully interrogated Murphy about his own union membership and the union membership of other employees. But my conclusion is that it would be improper to credit any part of Murphy's affidavit.

It appears that the Federal Rules of Evidence⁴ do not permit the receipt into evidence of a document such as Murphy's affidavit.⁵ But that is by no means the end of the matter since the Board has held that the contents of an affidavit given to a Board agent by an employee may, under some circumstances, be used as evidence affirmatively proving unlawful action by an employer, even where the employee who gave the statement was not an agent of the employer. *New Life Bakery*, 301 NLRB 421, 426 (1991); *Harrah's Marina Hotel & Casino*, 296 NLRB 1116, 1118 (1989); *Alvin J. Bart and Co.*, 236 NLRB 242 (1978); cf. *St. John Trucking*, 303 NLRB 723, fn. 3 (1991).⁶

⁴ Section 10(b) of the Act requires, inter alia, that hearings in unfair labor practice cases, "so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States"

⁵ Very briefly, the affidavit does not meet the requirements of Rule 801(d)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Evidence because, while the affidavit is "inconsistent with the declarant's testimony" (see, e.g., *U.S. v. Matlock*, 109 F.3d 1313 (8th Cir. 1997); 5 *Weinstein's Federal Evidence* §§801.10[2][b][iii], 804.03[4][b]), and while the affidavit "was given under oath," and while Murphy was "subject to cross-examination" (see, e.g., *U.S. v. Owens*, 484 U.S. 554, 108 S.Ct. 838 (1988)), recent discussion of Rule (d)(1)(A) suggests that the affidavit was not "given at a trial, hearing, or other proceeding, or in a deposition" (see, e.g., *Toys R Us*, 1993 WL 375862 (N.D.Ill. 1993); *Weinstein*, supra, §801.10[2][d]). Compare *Alvin J. Bart*, supra, at 243. Since no other provision in Rule 801(d) is even arguably applicable to the affidavit, the affidavit is "hearsay" (Rule 801(c)) and therefore inadmissible (Rule 802) in that none of the exceptions of either Rule 803 or 804 applies (even assuming, arguendo, that Murphy was "unavailable as a witness" for purposes of Rule 804: see, e.g., *Weinstein*, supra, §804.03[4][a] and [b]); cf. *New Life Bakery*, 301 NLRB 421, 426 (1991)).

⁶ I use the term "agent" in reference to the relationship between management and employees. See, e.g., *Injected Rubber Products Corp.*, 258 NLRB 687, 692-93 (1981); *Alvin J. Bart*, supra, 236 NLRB at 243, fn. 2.

I nonetheless shall recommend that the Board dismiss the allegations of the complaint that allege that UEC's management unlawfully interrogated employees.

I am not making that recommendation because of the persuasiveness of the denials by UEC's witnesses. The foreman, Lowy, did not testify.⁷ Anthony Vaccarelli did testify, and he did deny asking Murphy about anyone's union membership. But throughout the course of his testimony, Anthony Vaccarelli so often gave obviously inaccurate answers to the questions posed to him that I consider almost all of his testimony to be worthless.⁸

Rather, I am unwilling to credit Murphy's affidavit for these reasons:

1. There was no impelling reason for Murphy to have testified as he did in order to gain the favor of UEC. The General Counsel argues otherwise, contending that Murphy's parents still live in the general vicinity of Newburgh and that Murphy might accordingly someday want to work in that area again (even though Murphy worked and resided in North Carolina at the time of the hearing). But: whatever interest Murphy might conceivably now have for staying in UEC's good graces also, presumably, obtained in October 1996, when he gave the affidavit; UEC does not ordinarily undertake work near Newburgh; and the record contains no evidence whatever that Murphy ever planned to return to the Newburgh area again or, certainly, ever planned to move near UEC's primary area of business (Waterbury, Connecticut).⁹
2. If one were to engage in speculation about Murphy's motives in denying memory of the conversations at issue (as the General Counsel asks that I undertake), given the combination of Murphy's unfavorable views about unions and the fact that he gave his affidavit at the request of a union business agent, one might surmise that his affidavit might have been given, and might have taken the shape that it did, because of some kind of pressure exerted by the Union.
3. Nothing about Murphy's demeanor while on the witness stand suggested that Murphy had any particular interest in supporting UEC's position in this proceeding.
4. Murphy gave his affidavit almost a year after the events in question.
5. While the record is clear that, as a general matter, UEC is greatly interested in maintaining its non-union status, there is no evidence, apart from the affidavit, about the allegedly unlawful conversations themselves.
6. Although the affidavit itself states that Murphy read it, Murphy testified that, when the Board agent asked him to read it, in fact he merely looked for "key words." I credit that testimony. Additionally, the handwriting in which the affidavit is written is sufficiently difficult to read that I doubt that Murphy was able to read even every key word.

⁷ The record does not indicate whether Lowy remained in UEC's employ at the time of the hearing.

⁸ In theory, perhaps, I could find that the alleged interrogation occurred based alone on my discrediting of Anthony Vaccarelli. See *NLRB v. Walton Mfg. Co.*, 369 U.S. 404, 408 (1962), quoting *Dyer v. MacDougall*, 201 F.2d 265, 269 (2d Cir. 1952). But while I do not find Vaccarelli to be a credible witness, I am unwilling to find that the alleged interrogations did occur based on Vaccarelli's denial that they did not.

⁹ Waterbury is something over 60 miles from Newburgh.

7. Unlike at least one case in which the Board based its findings on the affidavit of an employee, the Board agent who took the affidavit did not testify.¹⁰

UEC'S FAILURE TO CONSIDER THE JOB
APPLICATIONS OF UNION MEMBERS

The work plan of the general contractor for the construction of the Pepsi-Cola bottling plant initially called for construction to move ahead rapidly – to proceed on a “fast track.” UEC's management concluded that, based on UEC's staffing needs at the Pepsi-Cola site necessitated by this fast track, UEC would have to hire additional employees. The plan was to bring on one of these additional employees in late November and then several more in December.

To effectuate this plan, UEC placed the following advertisement in a Poughkeepsie newspaper, for publication on November 18 (1995).

Electrician

Now accepting applications
for journeyman/apprentice.
Please apply at job site of
new Pepsi Cola of the
Hudson Valley. Call U.E.C.
203-574-0233

(This is the advertisement the led Murphy to call UEC.)

But starting at the end of November and on into December, the weather turned unexpectedly bad (even worse than usual for New England in late autumn). The general contractor ended its hopes for construction to proceed on a fast track, and that in turn diminished UEC's need for additional employees. The result: in mid-December UEC hired one employee, Jerry Deschaines, to work at the Pepsi-Cola site and thereafter was able to handle the work at the site without further increasing the number of persons employed by the Company.

Now let us return to the days immediately following the publication of UEC's help-wanted advertisement (November 18). At this point management still expected that it would need to hire a number of electricians in order to meet the demands of the Pepsi-Cola work. That, indeed, is why UEC placed the advertisement. (UEC's witnesses testified that the Company did not place the advertisement in order to find employees to hire. Rather, it was only “to test the waters and see what sort of labor force was available” in the Newburgh area. As just indicated, I do not credit that testimony.¹¹)

November 18 was a Saturday. By Tuesday (November 21), management had decided to hire Murphy to meet the Company's need for an additional employee at the Pepsi-Cola site in late November. (And, in fact, Murphy began work on November 27.)

On that same Tuesday, November 21, Union business agent Fratto, in response to UEC's advertisement, brought 32 electricians – each a member of the Union – to the Pepsi-Cola site where each filled out a UEC job application. The record is clear that many of the applicants, perhaps all of them, were fully qualified to handle UEC's needs at the Pepsi-Cola

¹⁰ The referenced case: *New Life Bakery*, supra, at 426.

¹¹ The quotation is from the testimony of Peter Vaccarelli.

site. Additionally, almost all of these union members lived relatively close to the site which, according to the credible testimony of a UEC witness, should have been a point in their favor. UEC's management knew or suspected that each of the 32 applicants was a member of the IBEW. (The names of the 32 IBEW members who applied to UEC for employment are listed below in Appendix B.)

UEC does not dispute that within days of receiving the 32 applications, management ordered that all of the applications be thrown away. There is no credible evidence that UEC's management considered any of the applications before issuing that order. (Anthony Vaccarelli testified that he reviewed "maybe a half dozen to a dozen" of the applications. I credit this testimony. But I find that while Vaccarelli did read some of the applications, he did not do so with a view to possibly hiring any of the applicants.)

According to UEC, its practice is to discard job applications five days after receiving them. Also according to UEC, management does not consider a job application unless, within those five days, the Company needs to hire another employee. UEC's treatment of the 32 job applications was thus squarely in line with its usual practice, UEC argues, in that management had decided to hire Murphy to fill the position that was going to become available on November 27, and UEC did not then (November 21) need anyone else.

For two reasons I do not credit the testimony of the UEC witnesses to that effect. First, the record shows that it is not UEC's invariable practice to quickly discard job applications. More importantly, I have found that UEC placed the November 18 advertisement in order to locate employees it expected to need beginning in December. Until early December management continued to expect that UEC would need a number of additional employees (in addition to Murphy), starting sometime in December.

Why, then, did UEC discard the job applications of those 32 IBEW members?

In this context UEC's "Policy Manual" is of some considerable significance. It reads, in part (with emphasis in the original):

Our Merit shop Company . . . is union free. * * *

We have the ability, the desire, the expertise, and the personnel to solve our problems and move forward by working together in the **Merit Shop Way** . . . without interference from union outsiders, who often have their own interests to protect. . . . [W]e believe a labor union is unnecessary and unwanted here at **United Electrical Contractors, Inc.**

Recognizing . . . the company philosophy of preserving the legal right to perform construction on an open shop basis, the company has neither national nor local area agreements with the building trade unions. The company is not a union [contractor] and will defend its open shop status and its legal right to work open shop to the full extent of the law.

. . . . Company management is required to understand, support, and do everything legally possible to defend this open shop posture.

* * *

Open shop: The condition under which employees are employed upon the basis of their skills and qualifications rather than upon membership in a given labor organization.

I shall assume that UEC violates no law by including that language in its Policy Manual.¹² But here we have otherwise inexplicable behavior by UEC in respect to the 32 job applications submitted by union members. My conclusion is that this behavior, coupled with management's intense preference that UEC remain non-union (as laid out in the Policy Manual), adds up to the likelihood that UEC disposed of the applications without considering any of them because of the applicants' membership in the IBEW and not for any other reason.¹³

As touched on earlier, on December 15 UEC added electrician Jerry Deschaines to its Pepsi-Cola work force. Deschaines had never before worked for UEC. While the record is not definitive on this point, more likely than not Deschaines was not a member of any union. (Deschaines did not testify.) Almost surely UEC assumed that Deschaines was not a member of the IBEW if only because Deschaines' previous job was with a non-union contractor.

Deschaines submitted his written employment application to UEC on December 4; thus UEC must have offered Deschaines the job sometime between December 4 and December 15.

Deschaines is a friend of Murphy's, and Deschaines came to management's attention by way of a recommendation from Murphy. There is no credible evidence in the record about when Murphy made that recommendation. But for our purposes, that matters little since, as just noted, UEC did not offer the job to Deschaines until December and since there is no credible evidence that management had previously definitively decided to hire Deschaines.

What that adds up to is this: (1) UEC's management discarded 32 job applications, without considering any of them, because of the IBEW membership of the applicants; (2) at the time that management took this action, it expected that in the near future the Company would be hiring a number of additional electricians for employment at the Pepsi-Cola job site; (3) in fact UEC did hire one electrician, Jerry Deschaines, for employment at the Pepsi-Cola site, and it was subsequent to UEC's receipt of the 32 job applications that UEC made the decision to offer the job to Deschaines.

UEC thereby violated Section 8(a)(3) and 8(a)(1) of the Act. E.g., *The 3E Co.*, 322 NLRB 1058 (1997), enfd. mem. No. 97-1127 (DC Cir. Dec. 29, 1997); *Refrigeration Systems Co.*, 321 NLRB 1085, fn. 2 (1996); *D.S.E. Concrete Forms*, 303 NLRB 890, 896 (1991); *Wright Line*, 251 NLRB 1083 (1980), enfd. 662 F.2d 899 (1st Cir. 1981), cert. denied 455 U.S. 989 (1982), approved in *NLRB v. Transportation Management Corp.*, 462 U.S. 393 (1983).¹⁴

¹² The General Counsel does not contend that anything in UEC's Policy Manual violates the Act in any respect.

¹³ The record shows that Fratto (the IBEW business agent) sought to discuss with Peter Vaccarelli the possibility of UEC entering into a collective-bargaining agreement with the IBEW and that Vaccarelli responded in an entirely cordial manner. UEC contends that this shows that UEC was prepared to employ IBEW members under appropriate circumstances. But my conclusion is that this evidence proves nothing of the kind.

¹⁴ I note that the violation of Section 8(a)(3) and (1) occurred at the moment that UEC, for anti-union reasons, opted not to consider the applications of the IBEW members. E.g., *Smith and Johnson Construction Co.*, 324 NLRB No. 153, slip op. at 16 (Oct. 31, 1997); *The 3E Co.*, supra, 322 NLRB at fn. 2 and 1061-62.

REMEDY

If UEC, had it acted nondiscriminatorily, would have hired one of the 32 IBEW members who applied for work on November 21, 1995 (instead of hiring Deschaines), UEC must make that applicant whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits, computed on a quarterly basis from December 15, 1995, to the date of Deschaines' final layoff by UEC, less any net interim earnings, as prescribed in *F.W. Woolworth Co.*, 90 NLRB 289 (1950), plus interest as computed in *New Horizons for the Retarded*, 238 NLRB 1173 (1987).

Since the record does not show whether, under those circumstances, UEC would have hired any of the 32 IBEW members who applied for work, the resolution of that issue will be left to the compliance stage. See, e.g., *Refrigeration Systems Co.*, supra; *D.S.E. Concrete Forms*, supra, 303 NLRB at 899; *KRI Constructors*, 290 NLRB 802 (1988).

The General Counsel proposes another form of remedy. According to the General Counsel, the Board should require that UEC pay to each of the applicants 1/32 of the remuneration that UEC paid to Deschaines for his work at the Pepsi-Cola job site. That's an interesting notion in that it obviates the need for the Board to decide which of the IBEW members' applications UEC would have favored had UEC abided by the requirements of the Act. But the General Counsel's proposal fails to take into account the lack of evidence in the record that UEC, even had it acted non-discriminatorily, would have hired an IBEW member instead of Deschaines. Additionally, the proposal ignores interim earnings issues.

ORDER¹⁵

The Respondent, United Electrical Contractors, Inc. (UEC), its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Failing to consider an employee's application for employment because of the employee's membership in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, or in any other labor organization.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) Make whole, in the manner described in the remedy section of this decision, an employee listed in Appendix B for any losses that he or she may have suffered by reason of UEC's refusal to consider to the employee for employment.

(b) Preserve and, within 14 days of a request, make available to the Board or its agents for examination and copying, all payroll records, social security payment records, timecards, personnel records and reports, and all other records necessary to analyze the amount of

¹⁵ If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

backpay due under the terms of this Order.

5 (b) Within 14 days after service by the Region, post at its facility in Waterbury, Connecticut, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix A."¹⁶ Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 2, after being signed by a representative of UEC, shall be posted by UEC immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by UEC to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event that, during the pendency of these proceedings, 10 UEC has gone out of business or closed the facility involved in these proceedings, UEC shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice to all current employees and former employees employed by UEC at any time since November 21, 1995.

15 (c) Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that UEC has taken to comply.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the complaint is dismissed insofar as it alleges violations of the Act not specifically found.

Dated, Washington, D.C., February 2, 1998

25
30
35
40
45

Stephen J. Gross
Administrative Law Judge

¹⁶ If this Order is enforced by a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "POSTED BY ORDER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD" shall read "POSTED PURSUANT TO A JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS ENFORCING AN ORDER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD."

APPENDIX A

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

5 Posted by Order of the
National Labor Relations Board
An Agency of the United States Government

10 The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated the National Labor Relations Act
and has ordered us to post and abide by this notice.

WE WILL NOT fail to consider an employee's application for employment because of the em-
ployee's membership in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, or in any
other labor organization.

15 WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the
exercise of the rights guaranteed to employees by Section 7 of the Act.

20 WE WILL make whole a member of the IBEW who applied to us for work on November 21,
1995, for any losses that he or she may have suffered by reason of our discriminatory refusal to
consider hire him or her for employment.

25 _____
United Electrical Contractors, Inc.,
(Employer)

30 Dated _____ By _____
(Representative) (Title)

35 This is an official notice and must not be defaced by anyone.

40 This notice must remain posted for 60 consecutive days from the date of posting and
must not be altered, defaced, or covered with any other material. Any questions concerning this
notice or compliance with its provisions may be directed to the Board's Office, 26 Federal Plaza,
Room 3614, New York, New York 10278-0104, Telephone 212-264-0346.

45

APPENDIX B

The following members of Local 363, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,
 5 AFL-CIO, submitted job applications to United Electrical Contractors, Inc., on November 21,
 1995.

10	Bob Anisky	James Myers
	Jim Bothwell	Ed Onderdonk
	Paul Canino	Howard Preuss
	Tony Clausi	Bob Radulski
15	Dallas Cox	Russell Robbins
	Bill Critchlow	Bill Rohr
	Mike Drucker	Michael Ruggiero
20	Pat Foote	Dave Schnitzer
	Dave Gordon	Mike Schuster
	Leroy Helm	Stoney Smith
25	Patricia Hoover	Perry Staples
	Mike Hubert	Jim Starr
	Andy Karadontes	Fred Swee
	Dave Kellogg	John Toporowski
30	Rudolph Mitchlewski	Gary Warden
	Fred Munger	Robert Wixon

35

40

45